DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 837 CG 005 049

AUTHOR Garai, Josef E.
TITLE The Message of Youth in an Age of Revolutionary Change.
INSTITUTION Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45
DESCRIPTORS *Activism, Change Agents, Environment, Foreign Relations, Human Relations, Institutions, International Programs, *Political Attitudes, Power Structure, *Social Change, *Social Problems, Social Responsibility, Student Attitudes, Student Participation, Values, Violence, *Youth

ABSTRACT

Youths' demand for radical changes in our society are discussed. Although their efforts are often misinterpreted as being destructive and unreasonable we cannot ignore the profound dissatisfactions of those whose main goal is to make the institutions which man has created responsive to man's basic needs. Most young people are aware of the hypocrisy present in our nation and other countries and feel emeshed in a variety of paradoxical situations and contradictions. The goals of the young generation have been summarized by Kenneth Keniston and include such objectives as a new orientation toward the future, new pathways of personal development, new values for living, new styles of human interaction, new ways of learning, new ways of knowing, new concepts of man in society, new types of social organization, new patterns of international relations, and new controls on violence. Proposals for the realization of these goals are presented and if acted upon may save us from nuclear destruction and help us lead peaceful lives in a liveable environment. (Author/RSM)

ED036837

THE MESSAGE OF YOUTH IN AN AGE OF REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE

Josef E. Garai, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Pratt Institute
Brooklyn, New York

The decisions which are made by the leaders of the big nations during the next few years will determine the future of mankind. Indeed, they will determine whether mankind does have any future at all. At the present crucial juncture in history when the prospects for the building of a world of peace and affluence have for the first time moved within the realm of reality, the youhg people all over the world feel haunted by the specter of poverty and war. Their increasing dismay at the unwillingness of their elders to listen to their demands for radical change compels them to engage in violent confrontations with the power structure which tends to misinterpret their motives as destructive and unreasonable. But we cannot ignore the profound dissatisfaction of the most sensitive and concerned among the young people. It behooves us to listen carefully to the message which they want to transmit to us through their protests if we are seriously concerned about our own welfare and that of the young generation. For it is their main goal to make the institutions which man has created responsive to man's basic needs.

The young people have always heard their elders pay lip service to the ideals of democracy, equal opportunity for all, and the guarantee of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Most young people are only too painfully aware of the cleavage between promise and delivery. They feel enmeshed in a variety of paradoxical situations which have been characterized by Erik Erikson (1) as polarities peculiar to our society. Similar polarities, however, with significant local

CG005049

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

variations, have made their appearance in most other countries of late, ranging from the advanced industrialized nations to those which are only slowly emerging from agricultural feudalism. At a time of rapid social change, these polarities tend to tear the fabric of the nation to shreds unless their impact is lessened by the type of rational planning which provides unity and cohesion in the midst of diversity.

Whether they are rich or poor, black or white, honor students or dropouts, the complaints of the young people are surprisingly similar. They feel that they are not given enough opportunities to make their own choices, that they are unable to control their own destinies, and that the current system of society with its excessive bureaucratization of existing supertechnologies provides no scope for their initiative and resourcefulness. All the major decisions affecting their own future have already been made or are being made by others who fail to comprehend their needs and goals. Wherever they turn, an insensitive bureaucratic power structure demands total submission to its norms, rules, and regulations. The greatest material benefits and status awards are reaped by those who exhibit the highest degree of conformity to the existing system without questioning its basic purpose. Those who seek change attempting to make the institution responsive to the needs of the people served by it will inevitably sooner or later meet with the violent resistance to change intended to preserve the bureaucratic structure intact.

Those among the young who have made a determined commitment toward effecting genuine change run headlong into prolonged confronta-

tions with the defenders of the status quo who may pose as promoters of "orderly change and rational debate." One of the most infuriating aspects of the struggle against autocratic rule is the misuse of the language of change and democracy by those who continuously undermine any real change to perpetuate the status quo. For them "orderly change" means keeping things the way they are and "rational debate" accepting the reasoning which they happen to advance as the only reasonable choice. The hypocrisy which is revealed by this semantic game explains in part the young generation's growing distrust of our dedication to democratic processes. They are fully aware of the fact that those in power are eager to resort to democratic procedures whenever the majority can be exploited to serve their own vested interests while they are just as ready to prevent the exercise of democratic procedures whenever the majority happens to oppose their rule.

The betrayal of the power structure left most of the young with feelings of hopelessness and despair. Mass escape into alienation characterized by beatnikism, the hippie movement, experimentation with drugs, compulsive sex, astrology, and sorcery, permitted only tangential interest in political activism. But most of the young people, though early disillusioned, have meanwhile learned to seek the road toward genuine change by asserting their feelings of hope and compassion with others who share the state of powerlessness with them. They have progressively matured, moving from powerlessness toward acceptance of the possibility that they themselves

might attain some power in determining their own fate. Now that the tendency toward alienation is increasingly replaced by political activism, involvement in revolutionary movements, and growing awareness of socioeconomic crosscurrents, it is all the more surprising that many of those people who used to complain about excessive alienation of students should be so profoundly disturbed at the manifestation of student activism. No wonder that the young are suspicious of revolutionaries among their teachers who preach revolution in the safe confines of the classroom and then proceed to denounce those students who take their teachings seriously as troublemakers and conspirators who should be severely disciplined or even expelled from the groves of academe.

The young feel that the rhetoric of change is too often used to undermine real change. They sense that those who preach progress and equal opportunity are only too easily swayed toward thwarting real equality wherever their own vested interests or their unfairly maintained privileges are called into question. They invariably stop listening as soon as something more than mere promises to consider alternatives to existing structures and processes is demanded. Listen to Carla Heffner who verbalized the feelings of students in her commencement address at Sarah Lawrence University with the following eloquent words before the graduating class of 1969: "We are against imperialism, poverty,racism, corporate and military powers. We are for a society in which people have control over their own lives. To avoid listening to us, some say we are psychologically unstable. If it's

mental illness to find no value or stability in a country where there is increasing poverty in the midst of increasing wealth, if it is mental illness which refuses to let us see how white men killing Asian men on Asian soil cannot be seen as American aggression, then I suppose we are mentally ill. But it can only follow that what is called sanity in this society is a far worse disease. Wherein lies the sanity of the trend - cited by George Wald of Harvard - toward militarization? What kind of country is it that spends 80 billion dollars per year on the military, while its people are starving and welfare funds are cut every day? And what can a nation mean when it gives priority to ABM while it closes poverty centers, job programs, libraries, hospitals? Such a country values money more than it values the lives of its people."

Among the contradictions which arouse the justified indignation of the young people, the paradox of the living room war is perhaps the most poignant one. The Vietnamese conflict is the first large-scale war which has been brought by the medium of television into the homes of all Americans. It is a macabre sight to observe a family sitting peacefully around the dinner table watching the "live show" from the battlefields in Vietnam. While consuming a luscious five-course meal, they can watch Vietnamese children being disfigured or burned alive by napalm or the enemy being bombed back into the stone age with shells and fragmentation bombs or some of their own compatriots bleeding to death. Astronomical figures of enemy casualties are announced to make the American people bear their own losses magnanimously. In former wars, most citizens experienced some deprivation in their own lives caused by scarcities of goods and resources diverted to the war ef-

fort. This time most people appear to feel only some remote depersonalized connection with this war despite the fact that it is literally conducted before their own eyes. Only when some relative of theirs is killed or injured do they awaken to the horror of this colonialistic adventure. This incredible level of barbarity and dehumanization to which our so-called civilization has sunk is profoundly resented by the young who fear that this same dehumanized fury can one day become directed against them and all those who seek ways of conciliation both in our foreign policy and in the domestic civil strife.

The young do not feel secure now that the current administration has decided to extricate our country from the Vietnam quagmire. They realize that the decision was made only because even our military leaders are forced to admit the fiasco of a lost war. They are unhappy because they know that the military establishment will not be dismantled after this defeat and that the withdrawal will not be based on the acceptance of the necessity for a durable peace. As long as this country does not move toward real and total disarmament, the formidable war machine continues to throw its shadow on all aspects of our foreign policy. The illusion that war can be used as a means to resolve outstanding international conflicts in the atomic age has not yet been abandoned. As long as this fiction still prevails, the Damocles s· ord of nuclear annihilation will continue to hang over the heads of the present generation and place its survival in doubt.

The paradoxes of the living room war are too numerous to be included in our discussion. Children who have been maimed, burned, disfigured, and crippled by napalm or fragmentation bombs must beg to be

among the few chosen ones who are flown to the United States to undergo plastic surgery to restore them to some of the semblance they possessed before we exposed them to this flaming death threat hurled upon them out of nowhere in the sky. With reference to the siege of Benhet, the New York Times of July 3, 1969, reports as follows: "Preliminary statistics made public today indicate that up to 20 million pounds of bombs and 140,000 artillery shells were used by the allies during the fighting. This means that an average of more than 11,000 pounds of bombs and 75 shells were required for each of the 1,800 enemy deaths attributed to air and artillery strikes." How can we comprehend such monstrous mass destruction? No wonder that the young people are appalled at the logic of those who make our foreign policy when they observe them sending over half a million of combat troops with one million back-up forces in surrounding countries 10,000 miles overseas to fight for the "freedom" of the Vietnamese while meanwhile over three million people out of a total population of fourteen million in Vietnam have become refugees in their own country. It is a country where a puppet government puts all those who want real peace in jail, and where highly fertile rice paddies have been transformed into deserts and whole forests defoliated and the food poisoned by those who come to bring "freedom."

The young also ask why the United States government which seems to be so preoccupied with the preservation of freedom throughout the world does not feel that the violation of human rights, the persecution of innocent citizens, and the establishment of police states with Gestapo-like apparatuses as, for instance, in Greece, South Africa, Rhodesia, Indonesia, and Argentina deserve at least the type of intervention

which is characterized by public condemnation, resort to international bodies such as the United Nations, and the use of economic boycott and sanctions to prevent further violations of the rights of the citizens in those countries. Certainly the economic power of the United States is mighty enough to constitute a lever for change toward greater democratization provided that our government is resolved to withhold the benefits of trade and economic cooperation from totalitarian governments. The small country of Cuba whose totalitarian government has at least brought about changes from which the masses benefit to some extent must experience all the fury of our economic and political reprisals, whereas fascist governments with their reactionary economic practices strengthening oligarchies of wealth benefit from the liberal trade policy of our government.

Another paradox is created by the opposing tendencies of the society of affluence to provide increased opportunities for experimentation, individual fulfillment, and freedom of expression, on the one hand, while the erosion of all of these assets is simultaneously threatened by the tendency toward increased repression and invasion of the privacy of the individual. The press is full of reports indicating the lack of freedom of expression in the Communist countries as compared to the "unlimited freedom of expression" which is supposedly the hallmark of the American democratic system. The recent revelation that Martin Luther King's telephone was tapped and that the tapping of telephones of students and militants, whether black or white, is a common practice, the infiltration of spies, detectives, F.B.I. and C.I.A. agents among campus, black power, and other movements, the increasing

threats of reprisal against students and faculty who wish to restructure the university to make it more relevant to the needs of society, and many other ominous signs of increased police state methods, give rise to serious doubts about the scope and actuality of the proclaimed "freedom of expression" in our society. In a period of rapid change, the combined resources of the police, the National Guard, and special riot control units are increasingly used to prevent peaceful demonstrations and restrained but determined dissent. Teargasses like mace and CN which have been denounced as dangerous even by such a conservative body as the American Medical Association are used to repress dissent, and students who want to transform a plot of land into a park, assaulted with helicopters spraying them with buckshot. The violence against the domestic "enemy" is currently practiced to enable the military and police forces to repress dissent inside the country to the same extent as they have been attempting to force the "outer enemy" in Vietnam to its knees.

The young are rapidly learning that freedom is indivisible. A country must have a solemn commitment to the upholding of the freedom of its own citizens as well as to that of citizens of all other countries throughout the world. Spying, intrusion into the private world of people, manipulation of individuals as pawns against others, and similar methods are merely expressions of the same debased values which have led us to the quagmire of Vietnam and which, if allowed to continue unmitigated, will slowly but surely lead the world to nuclear annihilation. The young are profoundly aware of the fact that the main problem of the current world situation is that of establishment of mutual

trust among the nations of the world and among the citizens inside each country. Old concepts of secret power manipulation, of exploitation of people to serve as spies and vilifiers of other people, must yield to a new ethical commitment which declares these practices as immoral, untenable, and contemptible. Our educational system ought to be enlisted in this struggle which from the very beginning must inculcate upon the young the necessity to cooperate with others rather than to compete, to assist others to gain increased competence and self-fulfillment, and to pledge not to exploit, denounce, spy upon, or otherwise humiliate and damage any of their fellow-men.

Another paradox consists in the phenomenon that the richest country in the world with the highest per capita income still permits many glaring injustices to persist which other less fortunate countries have at least begun to eliminate. One fifth of the population, i.e., over forty million people live below the minimum level of existence in conditions of poverty, about ten million people are suffering from various forms of malnutrition, there is no national health insurance system which promises high-quality health care to all citizens while makeshift Medicare and Medicaid programs are abused by greedy physicians to enrich themselves and the poor are deprived of all the basic services. In the United States, even those who are enrolled in various medical care programs face impoverishment or significant decrease in their standard of living when affected by serious diseases, let alone those who have no monetary resources or accumulated savings. The status of mass transportation throughout the country is deplorable and those who cannot afford a car are suffering incredible disadvantages when they must rely on

inner-city, suburban, or interurban transportation. The ugliness of the urban design, the incredible dirtiness of our cities, the rapid deterioration of the air we breathe and the water we drink as a result of air and water pollution, the wholesale extermination of plant and fish life resulting from all of these indicate that the country does not want to enlist its best brains in the creation of a livable environment for its citizens. The young want to replace the lack of concern and planning with full utilization of our engineering and industrial expertise to resolve the problem of creating a livable environment.

In a recent address to an audience at the Museum of Natural History in New York, Margaret Mead (3) discussed the present generation gap. She pointed out that the gap that exists between today's youth and the previous generation is world-wide and that its causes cannot be attributed to specific historical events in the United States, China, England or Pakistan. Although specific events help explain the particular forms of youthful rebellion in various parts of the world, these events are essentially secondary and incidental to the universal phenomenon of revolt. Of primary importance in creating that phenomenon is that, for the first time in human history, mankind is conscious of being part of a single community. As a result of rapid air travel and the world-wide dispersion of information via television, the ties between men have become much more clearly defined, demonstrating to the young, at least, that they have a great deal in common with their counterparts around the globe. The impact of recent scientfic and technological developments has been felt by old as well as young and even by members of isolated societies. But because today's world is the only one they have

ever known, the young, despite the fact that they do not hold positions of power or control educational and apprenticeship systems, are in a unique position to indicate how we can improve today's world. The children, the young, must ask the questions that we would never think of, but enough trust must be reestablished so that we will be permitted to work on the answers. Margaret Mead thus confirms the profound analysis of the causes of campus unrest contained in the widely acclaimed address delivered by Dr. George Wald, the Nobel Prize winner, at Harvard University (5).

Margaret Mead divides societies into the following three types: post-figurative, co-figurative, and pre-figurative. For centuries, societies were primarily post-figurative, depending on the transmission of cultural information from old to young, who then lived their lives much as their grandparents and ancestors had. Small changes that occurred in the culture were incorporated into the scheme of things and the society as a whole remained essentially unchanged. But in co-figurative cultures, this predominance of the past and of traditional ways of thinking and acting changed to an emphasis on the present. The shift from a wholly post-figurative culture to a co-figurative one was most vividly illustrated by the condition of immigrants to a new country, when the young adults had to take their own adaptations or their peer groups as models. Today's generation represents a pre-figurative or third type of culture in which the child and not the parent or grandparent is the representative of what is to come. Margaret Mead, in her own words, describes this movement toward a new type of society as follows: "We move from the closed system in which the present repeated the past,

although with elegant and progressive - or grossly degenerative - variations, to an explicit recognition that the past must now be treated as a means, the path by which we came. . .The future must be centered in the children, those whose capabilities are least known, and whose choices must be left open" (3, p. 33).

In other words, Margaret Mead senses the difference of the current revolt of youth from the type of youthful rebellion we have witnessed in the past. Our scientific advances and the ensuing immense expansion of all spheres of human life, natural resources, utilization of electronic and atomic power, and exploration of outer space and the depth of the sea, have created totally new conditions of global interaction which make our compartmentalized tribal and nationalistic attitudes strangely outmoded and irrelevant. Nevertheless our habits of thought and our comprehension of economic and political problems are still based on perceptions of power relations and processes of human interaction which stem from the perceptual frame of reference of smaller and less interdependent territorial units to which we were accustomed in the past. The young people are living within the reality of the closely-knit world which our generation has helped to create. They know that all the distinctions of race, creed, color, sex, tribe, nationality, ethnic affiliation, professional expertise, academic disciplines, however valid they may be for purposes of classification, are rapidly losing any meaning when they are upheld as barriers to worldwide understanding and communications. For them, the danger from China or Russia is much less threatening than the danger that may arise from our own preoccupation with the maintenance of an oversized military establish-

ment. They cannot make any sense out of our war games and the discussions centering around the anti-ballistic missile or ABM and the multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles or MIRV or any other mythically effective weapons defense system which is supposed to safeguard us from nuclear destruction.

Margaret Mead, in her lecture, explains this global vision of young people as follows: "Their eyes have always seen satellites in the sky. They have never known a world in which war did not mean annihilation . . . They know that, as members of one species living on one planet, all invidious distinctions based on races must vanish" (3, p. 32). By contrast, their parents who grew up before World War II during another period of great change, still tend to see things more in terms of past experiences and ways of dealing with crises. Margaret Mead further observes: "To this day the majority of those over 25 have failed to grasp emotionally - however well they may grasp it intellectually - the difference between any war, no matter how terrible, in which part of mankind survives, and one in which no one survives. They continue to think of nuclear war or other scientific wars of extinction as simply worse wars, with more horrible weapons, and scientists form committees, not to prevent all war but to prevent the use of special kinds of warfare for which they feel an uncomfortable special responsibility (3, p.32).

From my own involvement in the struggle of students for the restructuring of the university I have learned a number of things which I would like to share with those who claim to see nothing but anarchy and rebelliousness in the current student revolution. During two weeks of a spontaneously called strike students and teachers had many opportunities

to discuss the issues raised by a number of dissatisfied students. The most fascinating experience consisted in the discovery that many students had developed a profound awareness of the crosscurrents and pressures interwoven in the fabric of the university and of the relationship of these structures and processes to the world at large. Despite all accusations they began to set about the restructuring of the university and the educational process with a determination and competence which put many experienced teachers to shame. Their main goal was to obtain actual participation in the decision-making process. They felt that they had "to do their thing" and to search for effective channels to make their needs and demands known, listened to, and acted upon. Their basic contention was that the various curricula imposed by the faculty were putting them in a straitjacket. They felt that they should be allowed to make their own choices and that they should have a decisive voice in the determination of curricula, courses, and the hiring and firing of faculty. One of their main demands referred to the type of teaching they expected to be going on in the classroom. The teacher was to be a resource person who would assist the students in the clarification of problem areas which they themselves determined were important to them. They wanted to get away from the tyranny of the curriculum, the prescribed text, the clearly circumscribed content not because they were afraid to tackle the difficulties of disciplined work but because they felt that the essence of learning consists in exploration, constant questioning, and challenging of most of the assumptions made in the textbooks. But most of all they demanded meaningful involvement in social change. Their

constant endeavor was to make sure that they could actually apply their learning and skills to the improvement of the life of the people in the surrounding ghetto community of Pratt Institute. They felt the urge to make their learning relevant to life, community, and the world at large. Needless to say that such unorthodox ideas aroused the wrath and violent opposition of the majority of the faculty and only a minority of so-called radical faculty members were able to identify with the goals of the students.

The goals of the young generation have been most eloquently summarized by Kenneth Keniston in his recent book "The Young Radicals" (2). He states that these young men and women seek <u>new forms of adulthood</u>, in which the principled dedication of youth to the betterment of society can be continued in adult work that does not require blind acceptance of the established System, but permits continuing commitment to social change. They seek a <u>new orientation to the future</u>, one that avoids the fixed tasks and defined lifeworks of the past in favor of an openness and acceptance of flux and uncertainty. They seek <u>new pathways of personal development</u> wherein the openness of youth, its fluidity, growth, and change, its responsiveness to inner life and historical need, can be maintained throughout life. They seek <u>new values for living</u>, values that will fill the spiritual emptiness created by material affluence. They seek <u>new styles of human interaction</u> from which the participants grow in dignity and strength. They seek <u>new ways of knowing</u>, ways that combine intense personal conviction with relevance and enduring adequacy to the facts. They seek <u>new kinds of learning</u>, learning that maximizes the involvement of the intellect in the individual's experi-

ence, instead of divorcing the two. They seek new concepts of man in society, concepts that acknowledge the unique individuality of each human being without denying man's social imbeddedness, that stress social involvement without neglecting the special potential that is often covered by social role. They seek new formulations of the world, formulations that give adequate weight to the movement and change that is ubiquitous in their experience. They seek new types of social organization, institutional forms that include rather than exclude. They seek new tactics of political action that increase the awareness of those who take part in them and of those whom they affect. They seek new patterns of international relations, patterns within which men of diverse nations can respect both their common humanity and their cultural uniqueness. Perhaps most important, they seek new controls on violence, whether between man and man or between nation and nation. Products of the violence-ridden post-modern world, more aware of man's inner potential for violence than any previous generation, their most constant effort has been to put an end to the violence men do to each other, whether by racist oppression, hidden manipulation, or open war (2, pp. 287-289).

What are their proposals for the realization of these goals? Let us explore some of these areas to get a better comprehension of the approaches suggested by the young generation.

The establishment of a durable peace implies the dismantling of the military-industrial complex and the reassertion of civilian control over the military as long as the need for some kind of military structure remains. In the United States the military-industrial complex

against which President Eisenhower had so strongly warned future policy-makers has gained decision-making power in the field of foreign policy which amounts to a certain type of hidden military dictatorship. Military men attend all cabinet meetings, their advice is sought, and since their military expertise seems to provide them with some aura of political sophistication, their advice is likely to take precedence over that of others who counsel moderation. Arthur M. Schlesinger (4) describes the readiness of all the military men advising President John F. Kennedy during the Cuban crisis in the long cabinet meetings to suggest the strongest military response to the Russian penetration into the Cuban territorial waters including the use of atomic weapons. This tendency of military men to counsel the use of suicidal weapons in response to whatever they define as hostile provocation constitutes a grave danger to the survival of the human race. The young claim that in the atomic age any military force must make the prevention rather than the unleashing of nuclear war its main goal if it is really going to be effective in the defense of the country. If the generals fail to comprehend the awesome results stemming from any use of atomic arms, their advice cannot possibly ever be allowed to prevail over the balanced judgment of experienced students of international relations.

The only way to prevent the accidental or intentional use of atomic arms as a means to settle international conflicts is the reduction and eventual elimination of the huge nuclear stockpiles which a futile arms race has accumulated so far. Total disarmament must be the ultimate goal. Of course, the attainment of a world without war requires at the same time significant movement toward the establishment of a kind

of world government or international law court which supersedes the authority of individual nations. Therefore the young suggest that increased contacts among students, politicians, artists, and citizens of all nations be established to permit the discussion of ways and means to establish such a world government. Eventually there must be a world passport, a world court to defend human rights, a world material resources and manufactured goods distribution center, and the world organization must establish the institutions which can provide worldwide communication and global understanding.

The young are dismayed at the fact that our politicians are unable to move toward peace at the required pace. They have frequently been disappointed in their ardent hope that a basic change in our foreign policy would finally be brought about. No previous generation was so often and unexpectedly deprived of its hope for change as the current generation. Four times when this change appeared to be near, murder or political intrique frustrated the aspirations of progressive and forward-looking young people. International peace was set back with the murders of President John F. Kennedy and presidential aspirant Robert F. Kennedy and with the ugly behind-the-scenes wheeler-dealerism depriving Eugene McCarthy of his claim to victory at the Democratic Convention. Domestic peace and movement toward racial equality were set back by the murder of Martin Luther King, Jr. The belief of the young in the democratic process which had received a tremendous boost through the success of McCarthy's onslaught against President Johnson's war policy was shattered when they were forced to realize that the Presidential election brought to the fore a President who failed to recognize the basic challenges of the atomic age, although he seems to proceed reluctantly toward the conclusion of a war which has been lost. The fact that he and

his advisers still persevere in the illusion that they can retrieve around the negotiating table at least part of the victory which eluded them on the battlefield constitutes a bad omen for future foreign policy.

What the young really want is a genuine change in our foreign policy which takes into account the realities of the present time. Planning must be undertaken on a global level and involve the establishment of the type of international institutions and governmental bodies which provides a fair distribution of all natural and human resources to all countries so that a worldwide economic entity can replace the grueling competition which still maintains its sway throughout the world despite increasing movement toward international trade organizations. War must definitely be eliminated from any consideration as a means of conflict resolution and all conflicts must be submitted to an international body which will deliberate and decide their merit.

The main concern of the young today consists in their revolt against institutional violence. They feel that the institutions which our societies have created are no longer responsive to the needs of the people whom they were originally intended to serve. In their determination to provide justice they feel that every human being should be given an opportunity to develop his own potential to the best of his ability and that society must carry the responsibility for creating the types of institutions which permit such unfolding of maximum individual creativeness and self-expression. Society must also create the type of cooperative institutions which insure that those human beings who experience difficulties in the meeting of

their own needs can be given the required assistance toward either self-sufficiency or the type of dependency which comes to them as a right rather than as charity handed down from above. The age of paternalism has definitely come to an end.

Institutional violence consists in the phenomenon that certain institutions fail to care for the basic needs of the people. In general, we must redefine the purpose of all existing institutions in the light of modern insistence on the fulfillment of basic human needs and preservation of human rights. Therefore, for instance, all traditionally authoritarian and punitive institutions such as the prisons, the police, the courts of law, and the military, must be transformed into institutions which serve rehabilitation of persons designated as criminals or defendants or soldiers. Soldiers are to become genuine defenders of the peace and this must be done by their involvement in the solutions of social problems as long as their services are not directly needed to defend their country, they must be taught that their main purpose in life is to prevent war, just as the main task of the policeman is that of a mediator and educator to reduce ethnic and racial prejudice and that of a person trained to prevent social as well as individual injustice.

The young say that at present most institutions are set up to serve the convenience of the people who administer them. Hospitals are set up to satisfy the convenience of medical doctors and personnel, universities that of the university administration and, to some extent, faculty, business complexes that of their presidents, vice presidents, and bureaucracies, etc. The bureaucratization and computerized automation of existing institutions makes them frequently forget that they are really there to serve

the needs of those who turn to them for the purpose of obtaining certain services. Students, for instance, claim that universities do not care whether a student reaches the educational goal he has set for himself as long as he fulfills certain requirements and takes certain courses which those who design the curriculum regard as relevant to those goals. With a proliferation of new knowledge in all fields and the increasing need to restructure the subject matter in the light of recent research, most of the teachers are falling years and decades behind in their own understanding of new developments in their fields. The curricula are hopelessly outdated and students cannot understand the emphasis on Western civilization in a world which has long since recognized the vast contribution of Asian, African, and Latin American civilizations to the progress of the world community. They fail to understand why psychology and the social sciences are not replacing philosophy as a science, why interdisciplinary courses are still the exception rather than the norm, why admission standards to colleges should be mainly determined by verbal facility in an age where the audiovisual and other media are increasingly effective, and why the ability of leadership in peer groups or interest in community relations and involvement in social change should not weigh at least equally in their college admission, why they as the students who know their teachers better than anybody else should not be consulted in the selection and rehiring of teachers, and why they should not be given important decision-making power concerning all the matters which affect their scholastic life at all levels of education. Why must we proclaim that democracy is our ideal and at the same time compel the young to wait ad infinitum until they are permitted to participate in the so-called democratic process?

What kind of a democracy declares young people old enough to sacrifice their lives in a war while they are not considered old enough at the age of eighteen to twenty-one to have a voice whether the war should continue or not. "Old enough to die but not old enough to vote for one's country" is their outraged complaint. "Old enough to learn but not old enough to decide what is worthwhile to be learned" is another complaint.

The young are also wary of many of our sacred assumptions. We still adhere to a kind of magic belief in the ability of science to resolve all our individual and social problems. The young no longer entertain such a naive belief. They have witnessed the continued misuse of scientific advances for the construction of doomsday machines of death and they acknowledge the truth that science in and of itself is not a panacea unless mankind reaches the maturity to apply the fantastic advances of scientific research to the improvement of human life and the creation of a livable world. They are therefore at odds with those scientists who proclaim that their only responsibility lies in the creation of scientific products without regard to the use which others make of them.

The young are probably the most ethical generation ever to emerge throughout the ages. They have learned the lesson of the totality and indivisibility of human experience. This is all the more astonishing because they constitute perhaps the most fragmented, confused and diversified generation ever. But their intense experience of fragmentation and isolation has precisely set in motion those forces which permit them to see the absolute necessity for full integration of the human experience all the more clearly. They want to convey to us their wisdom which they have acquired in the crucible of their intense struggle against hypocrisy,

powerlessness, and distrust. This wisdom tells them and, hopefully, also all of us that intellect and feeling, body and mind, individual and society, nation and world, inner experience and outer reality are only different aspects of the same total human experience. The scientist is inevitably responsible for the consequences flowing from his scientific investigations and innovations, and if his discoveries are abused to wreak havoc and destruction, he must of necessity bear the guilt for this misapplication. The young tell us that we all have an ultimate responsibility for the welfare, safety, survival, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of all the persons throughout the world and that, wherever we condone the violation of any of these rights, we participate in acts of criminal negligence. The conspiracy of silence in the face of our witnessing such violations is no less criminally insane than active participation in the wreaking of such violence against human rights or the dignity of the individual. If one single black person on the globe is repressed and compelled to accept lesser opportunities than white people under similar circumstances, then the rights of all black people all over the world are violated.

Institutional violence is still the rule rather than the exception. We must only remember what happens to a person when he is sent to a hospital, a mental institution, a prison, or induced into the armed forces to realize that at that very moment a series of dehumanizing actions are directed against him to let him know that from now on he has no rights any longer as a human being. He must submit to the routine, rules, and regulations of these dehumanized institutions and any effort to assert his humanity and personal dignity is nipped in the bud. A soldier has no

right to express any opinion except that sanctioned by the military establishment, a mental patient is classified as paranoid when he protests against the violation of his individual rights to the psychiatrist, a prisoner cannot engage in sex relations with his wife and is subject to prolonged isolation from friends and family, and patients in hospitals are still not even asked whether they want to undergo a certain operation because the doctor claims to know best what is in the patient's interest.

What is the main lesson to be learned from the young? It is simple and worth listening to very carefully for if acted upon - and we have only very little time left to do so - it may yet save us from the doom of nuclear destruction and lead us toward life in a peaceful world and a livable environment. They tell us that they are citizens of the world in the first place and that any other loyalty whether to state, nation, ethnic group, religious affiliation, or racial entity must be subordinated to their world citizenship. They tell us that relations among individuals as well as among nations must be based on honesty, integrity, mutual trust, and respect and that the types of international governmental institutions to be established must guarantee the peaceful resolution of all international conflicts, and enforce strict adherence to principles of universal human rights in all countries. They want a world where there is unity and equal opportunity for each world citizen regardless of origin, sex, creed, class, or race and where cooperation replaces competition while diversity of cultural heritage and national or tribal experience are regarded as expressions of the infinite creativity and diversity of the human spirit. They want a world in which all institutions are governed by those people whom they are intended to serve and where accountability to the people by

those who administer the services is secured and publicly guaranteed. They want a world in which power becomes a responsibility rather than an opportunity to exploit, in which the need for the responsible use of power is inculcated from early childhood on and in which those legal, local, national, and international institutions that guarantee the rights of the individual to respect, dignity, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness actually possess the power to enforce their decisions. But above all, they want to make sure that they themselves wield the power to make the decisions over their own life and their own future. They are tired of dependence on the guidance of the misguided, and they want to guide the world toward safety themselves. We can and must preserve our trust in them and place our experience at their service.

REFERENCES

1. Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1950. Second enlarged edition, 1963.

2. Keniston, Kenneth. Young radicals: Notes on committed youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1968.

3. Mead, Margaret. Culture and commitment: Man and Nature lectures. To be published by The Natural History Press, New York, 1969. Quotes taken from: The Sciences, June 1969, Vol. 9, No. 6, published by The New York Academy of Sciences.

4. Schlesinger, Arthur M. A thousand days: John F. Kennedy in the White House. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1965.

5. George Wald. A generation in search of a future. Woodmont, Conn.: Promoting Enduring Peace, 1969 as reprinted from The New Yorker Magazine, Inc., March 22, 1969.